

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-19 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 4 because of an informality. Applicant has amended claims 3 and 4 to overcome this informality. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11-12, 15, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,692, hereinafter Monroe) in view of Manganaris et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0082886, hereinafter Manganaris).

At the outset, Applicant notes claim 1 has been amended to include “the mobile network being interconnected via an unreliable communication link to a terrestrial-based network security management system, the mobile network operable to transmit data to a user via a plurality of user access points . . . the intrusion detection system operable to detect a security intrusion event by the user of the mobile network . . . [and] to notify the user of the security intrusion event.” Claim 12 has been amended to include “detecting a security intrusion event whose origination is associated with a user on the network residing on the mobile platform . . . performing a security response activity in response to the detected security event to notify the user of the security intrusion event.” Similarly, Claim 19 has been amended to include “an intrusion detection system connected to the network and operable to detect a security intrusion event that is

associated with the network and caused by the user...an airborne security manager...to notify the user of the security intrusion event.” Applicant respectfully asserts the combination of Monroe and Manganaris does not teach or suggest Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 1, 12 and 19.

Monroe appears merely to disclose an electronic surveillance system which “provides both visual and/or audio information as well as critical data such as location, direction, intrusion, fire and/or smoke detection...” Monroe is silent to a system “operable to detect a security intrusion event by the user of the mobile network.” Rather, the primary purpose of Monroe would appear to be for monitoring the mobile platform “while in port or terminal and/or unattended whether taxing or parked or docked [and] permits tracking en route.” (See at least col. 1, lines 30-31). Thus Monroe’s invention provides for monitoring of the mobile platform itself and not a user on a mobile network on the mobile platform as claimed. Further, Monroe does not disclose notifying the user as claimed. Rather, Monroe appears to merely disclose notifying “selected personnel” of a security situation on the mobile platform. (See at least col. 7, lines 59-60). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits Monroe fails to teach or suggest Applicant’s invention as claimed.

Applicant also respectfully asserts the combination of Manganaris with Monroe is improper and fails to teach Applicant’s invention as claimed. Manganaris appears to teach merely a system for identifying data which may be indicative of a security breach on a network. (See at least [0020] and [0021]). Manganaris is silent to the use of his system with regard to a mobile platform. Further, the incorporation of Manganaris with Monroe would alter the principle of operation of Monroe and is improper. Specifically, if

the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959) MPEP 2143.01.

As the principle of operation Monroe's invention is to monitor the physical mobile platform itself, modifying Monroe with Manganaris, which focuses on monitoring data on a ground based network, would improperly modify Monroe. Further, as Monroe does not teach or suggest the desirability of this modification whatsoever, this modification is improper. Accordingly, as Monroe and Manganaris, neither alone nor in combination, teach Applicant's invention as claimed, Applicant asserts claims 1, 12 and 19 are patentable and in condition for allowance for at least these reasons. Additionally, as claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 15 and 17 depend from either claim 1 or 12, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Monroe and Manganaris et al. in further view of Schuba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,378). Claims 6, 10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Monroe and Manganaris et al. in view of ISA "An Introduction to Intrusion Detection Assessment for System and Network Security Management." Claims 8, 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Monroe and Manganaris et al. in view of Schuba et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.


Applicant notes claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 18 all depend from either independent claim 1 or 12. As stated previously, Applicant believes claims 1 and 12 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant believes claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 18 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 1, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Eichuk
Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer
Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps